

Samuel Maida (SBN 333835)  
HAUSFELD LLP  
580 California Street, 12th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: 415-633-1908  
Facsimile: 415-633-4980  
Email: [smaida@hausfeld.com](mailto:smaida@hausfeld.com)

Jeffrey J. Corrigan (*pro hac vice*)  
SPECTOR ROSEMAN & KODROFF, P.C.  
2001 Market Street, Suite 3420  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Tel: 215-496-0300  
Fax: 215-496-6611  
Email: [jcorrigan@srkattorneys.com](mailto:jcorrigan@srkattorneys.com)

Manuel J. Dominguez (*pro hac vice*)  
COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS & TOLL PLLC  
11780 U.S. Highway One, Suite N500  
Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33408  
Tel: 561-515-2604  
Fax: 561-515-1401  
Email: [jdominguez@cohenmilstein.com](mailto:jdominguez@cohenmilstein.com)

*Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel*

[Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

IN RE: DA VINCI SURGICAL ROBOT  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:  
ALL ACTIONS

Lead Case No: 3:21-CV-03825-AMO

**PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF MOTION  
AND MOTION TO AUTHORIZE CLASS  
NOTICE AND APPOINT NOTICE  
ADMINISTRATOR**

Hearing Date: March 5, 2026  
Time: 2:00 PM  
Courtroom: 10 – 19th Floor  
Judge: The Hon. Araceli Martínez-Olguín

**MOTION AND NOTICE OF MOTION**

**TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on March 5, 2026, or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard by the Honorable Araceli Martínez-Olguín in Courtroom 10 - 19th Floor, of the above-entitled Court, located at 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, Plaintiffs will and hereby do move pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 for an Order granting Plaintiffs' Motion to Authorize Class Notice and Appoint Notice Administrator.

This Motion is based on this Notice and Motion, the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities and exhibits thereto, the Declaration of Eric J. Miller and exhibits thereto, the pleadings and records on file herein, and such other evidence and arguments as may be presented to the Court prior to or at the hearing of this Motion.

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-1(b), Plaintiffs request that the Court decide this motion on the papers without oral argument.

## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

### I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c), Plaintiffs respectfully ask the Court to (1) approve Plaintiffs’ “Summary Notice” and “Detailed Notice,” (2) authorize Plaintiffs’ plan to distribute notice to members of the certified class, and (3) appoint A.B. Data, Ltd. as notice administrator.

Plaintiffs’ proposed notices, attached hereto as Exhibits A and B, satisfy Rule 23(c). The notices clearly and concisely describe, for example, the nature of the action, the definition of the class, and the options available to the class members, including whether, how, and when to opt out of the class action. Neither notice omits any information that the rules require.

Plaintiffs’ proposed means of delivering the notices—U.S. mail and email to those class members for whom email addresses are available, a dedicated litigation website, and supplemental paid media—offers the best notice practicable to the class members. Defendant Intuitive Surgical Inc. (“Intuitive”) does not oppose the content of the proposed notices or Plaintiffs’ dissemination plan but, contrary to law, suggests notice await the outcome of the Ninth Circuit’s decision in the *SIS* action.

In addition, Plaintiffs propose the appointment of A.B. Data as the notice administrator for the class. A.B. Data has been appointed as the class notice or claims administrator in thousands of cases—including cases in this District—and in numerous major antitrust class actions. *See* Decl. of Eric J. Miller ¶ 4, filed herewith (“Miller Decl.”). A.B. Data is well qualified to serve as notice administrator in this action, and Intuitive does not oppose its appointment.

### II. THE NOTICE PLAN SHOULD BE AUTHORIZED

#### A. The Notices Satisfy Rule 23.

The content of Plaintiffs’ proposed notices meets the requirements of Rule 23. When a class is certified under Rule 23(b)(3), “the court must direct to class members the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B). “The notice must clearly and concisely state in plain, easily understood language:

- 1 (i) the nature of the action;
- 2 (ii) the definition of the class certified;
- 3 (iii) the class claims, issues, or defenses;
- 4 (iv) that a class member may enter an appearance through an attorney if the member so
- 5 desires;
- 6 (v) that the court will exclude from the class any member who requests exclusion;
- 7 (vi) the time and manner for requesting exclusion; and
- 8 (vii) the binding effect of a class judgment on members under Rule 23(c)(3).”

9 *Id.* The proposed Summary Notice and Detailed Notice, working in concert, satisfy these  
10 requirements and constitute the best practicable notice.

11 ***The Summary Notice.*** Under Plaintiffs’ proposed plan, A.B. Data will send a Summary  
12 Notice directly to potential class members. *See generally* Ex. A. The Summary Notice provides  
13 basic information about the case and directs recipients to the Detailed Notice found on a dedicated  
14 litigation website. The Summary Notice states the nature of the class action, describes the  
15 Plaintiffs’ claims and Intuitive’s defenses, and recites the class definition. *Id.* It also provides  
16 information about class members’ right to exclude themselves, or “opt out,” including the time and  
17 manner for opting out, and explains that class members who do not opt out will be bound by the  
18 outcome of the litigation. *Id.* Lastly, the Summary Notice states that important information is  
19 contained in the Detailed Notice and provides a link to the dedicated litigation website where the  
20 Detailed Notice can be found. *Id.*

21 ***The Detailed Notice.*** All members of the public will be able to review the Detailed Notice  
22 on the dedicated litigation website. The Detailed Notice provides, in clear and concise language, a  
23 description of this case and a summary of Plaintiffs’ claims and Intuitive’s defenses, Ex. B at 4–5;  
24 the definition of the class, *id.* at 5; the legal rights and options of class members to remain in the  
25 litigation or to opt out, *id.* at 5–6; the process and deadline for requesting to opt out, *id.* at 6;  
26 information about the Court’s appointment of class counsel, *id.* at 6–7; the option for class  
27 members to hire counsel of their choosing and to enter an appearance through such counsel, *id.* at

7; and the binding effect of a class-wide judgment on class members who do not opt out, *id.* at 6; *see also* Miller Decl. ¶ 25.

The opt-out process described in the Detailed Notice protects the due process rights of class members. Any class member seeking exclusion must mail or email an opt-out request with: (1) basic information for the entity opting out; (2) basic information and the signature of the person opting out on the entity's behalf; (3) a statement that the entity wishes to opt out of the class; and (4) a statement that the person opting out on the entity's behalf has authority to do so. *See* Ex. B at 6. The proposed period for class members to opt out is 60 days, *id.* at 6, which provides class members ample time to choose whether to opt out.

Lastly, the Detailed Notice contains information routinely included in notices of pendency such as the potential for Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel to request attorneys' fees, expense reimbursements, and service awards for Class Representatives; and contact information for Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel and the Notice Administrator to request more information. *Id.* at 7–8; Miller Decl. ¶ 25. In addition, A.B. Data will staff a toll-free phone number, listed on both the Summary Notice and Detailed Notice, that potential class members may call to ask questions. Miller Decl. ¶¶ 19, 21–22; Ex. A; Ex. B at 8.

***The Litigation Website.*** The dedicated litigation website will offer the Detailed Notice in both English and Spanish and will include other important case documents, such as the Amended Complaint (ECF No. 52), the Order Granting Class Certification (ECF No. 333), the Order Re: Cross Motions for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 232), and the Order Granting Defendant's Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 287). Miller Decl. ¶ 20. The website will be secured with an "https" designation. *Id.*

Together, the Summary Notice and Detailed Notice, along with the dedicated litigation website, satisfy Rule 23.

**B. The Proposed Means of Distributing Notice Satisfies Rule 23.**

In addition to the content of the proposed forms of notice, Plaintiffs' proposed means of distributing notice meet the requirements of Rule 23. When a class is certified under Rule 23(b)(3),

1 “the court must direct to class members the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances,  
2 including individual notice to all members who can be identified through reasonable effort. The  
3 notice may be by one or more of the following: United States mail, electronic means, or other  
4 appropriate means.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B).

5 Plaintiffs propose that A.B. Data send the Summary Notice to class members by both U.S.  
6 mail and email, Miller Decl. ¶ 11, using class member contact information obtained from Intuitive.  
7 This contact information was compiled by Intuitive using pre-existing information and customer  
8 records and provided to Plaintiffs. Prior to emailing and mailing the Summary Notice, A.B. Data  
9 will utilize best industry practices and perform several tasks to maximize deliverability, such as  
10 standardizing and updating all mailing addresses through the United States Postal Service national  
11 change of address database. *Id.* ¶¶ 14–17. As mentioned above, the Summary Notice will provide  
12 basic information about the case and encourage readers to use the dedicated litigation website to  
13 review important information in the Detailed Notice, and the Detailed Notice will be available to  
14 all members of the public in both English and Spanish. *Id.* ¶ 20.

15 This program is the best practicable means of distributing notice to the class because the  
16 class members are hospitals, whose contact information is publicly available and unlikely to often  
17 change, and because they are former or current customers of Intuitive, which has records of having  
18 served them. Contacting the potential class members through direct mail and email will therefore  
19 be an effective and practical way of providing individual notice to all class members who can be  
20 identified through reasonable effort. Miller Decl. ¶ 20.

21 Additionally, to supplement the comprehensive direct notice, A.B. Data will employ a paid  
22 media plan (including digital and social media) to reach potential class members who may not  
23 receive the Summary Notice via email or mail. Customized banner ads will appear in e-newsletters  
24 available on medical device and diagnostic industry-related websites. Ads will also be targeted to  
25 users on LinkedIn who have identified themselves as hospital decisionmakers. These ads will  
26 appear across desktop, tablet, and mobile devices for 30 days. All digital and social media ads will  
27 include an embedded link to the case-specific website. Miller Decl. ¶ 18.

1 C. Notice is Appropriate Now.

2 Class members should receive notice now. “Ordinarily, notice to class members should be  
 3 given ***promptly*** after the certification order is issued,” Ann. Manual Complex Lit. § 21.311 (4th  
 4 ed.) (emphasis added); *see also* 7AA Wright & Miller, Fed. Prac. & Proc. Civ. § 1786 (3d ed.)  
 5 (“Rule 23(c)(2) does not specify when the required notice should be given. Generally, however, it  
 6 should be sent ***as soon as the court determines that a class action is proper*** under subdivision  
 7 (c)(1) so as to provide the absentees with a full and meaningful opportunity to intervene to protect  
 8 their rights or to opt out.” (emphasis added)). Prompt notice to the class “serves to inform absentees  
 9 who otherwise might not be aware of the proceeding that their rights are in litigation so that they  
 10 can take whatever steps they deem appropriate to make certain that their interests are protected. In  
 11 this way, it guarantees each class member an opportunity to have a day in court or, at least, to  
 12 oversee the conduct of the action by the representatives.” *Id.*

13 This Court issued the class certification order on March 31, 2025 (ECF No. 333), and on  
 14 May 22, 2025 the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals denied Intuitive’s petition to appeal the Court’s  
 15 decision pursuant to Rule 23(f). Order, *In re da Vinci Surgical Robot Antitrust Litig.*, No. 25-2395  
 16 (ECF 15.1). Plaintiffs have spent the intervening months engaging in an extensive request for  
 17 proposal (“RFP”) process to select a notice administrator, drafting forms of notice with the selected  
 18 administrator’s assistance, and working diligently with Intuitive to (1) negotiate and resolve a  
 19 multitude of notice-content disputes, and (2) locate up-to-date contact information for all class  
 20 members. Although all notice-language disputes are resolved, the parties have reached an impasse  
 21 as to the timing of notice dissemination.

22 Intuitive believes notice should be delayed until the appeals court issues its decision in  
 23 *Surgical Instrument Service Co. v. Intuitive Surgical, Inc.* (No. 25-1372), arguing that the outcome  
 24 of that appeal could impact claims and defenses in this case. That argument is a pretextual plea for  
 25 delay. The issues on appeal are too granular to have been included in the notices—indeed, neither  
 26 party ever sought to include any notice language on the issues raised in the *SIS* appeal—and any  
 27 impact they have on the class necessarily will be felt the same way by any opt-outs, so there will

1 be no need to issue a corrective notice regardless of the appeal's outcome. Moreover, the jury  
 2 instruction that SIS has appealed very likely will not be given in the class case, for a number of  
 3 different reasons, regardless of the outcome of SIS's appeal.

4 While some courts have delayed notice pending an appeal, they have done so only when  
 5 decertification may hang in the appeal's balance, such as in the Rule 23(f) context, thereby  
 6 warranting issuance of a corrective notice. *See, e.g., Whitman v. State Farm Life Ins. Co.*, No. 19-  
 7 CV-6025, 2021 WL 5824572 (W.D. Wash. Dec. 8, 2021) (delaying notice pending the defendant's  
 8 Rule 23(f) petition). As stated, Intuitive's Rule 23(f) petition was denied, and no aspect of SIS's  
 9 appeal implicates the propriety of class certification in this case.

10 Finally, the questions at issue in SIS's appeal are purely merits-based, and controlling law  
 11 requires notice prior to merits-based adjudication. *Schwarzschild v. Tse*, 69 F.3d 293, 295 (9th Cir.  
 12 1995) ("The purpose of Rule 23(c)(2) is to ensure that the plaintiff class receives notice of the  
 13 action *well before the merits of the case are adjudicated.*" (emphasis added)).

14 Plaintiffs' unopposed notices and means of their distribution satisfy Rule 23 and should be  
 15 authorized, and the notice plan should commence now and not after the appellate decision in *SIS*.

### 16 **III. A.B. DATA SHOULD BE APPOINTED AS NOTICE ADMINISTRATOR**

17 A.B. Data is qualified and ready to administer Plaintiffs' proposed notice plan and should  
 18 be appointed to do so. Intuitive does not oppose the appointment. A.B. Data is a class action notice  
 19 and claims administration firm that specializes in designing, developing, analyzing, and  
 20 implementing large-scale legal notification plans. Miller Decl. ¶ 4. Collectively, the management  
 21 team at A.B. Data has overseen the administration of notices in more than 1,500 class actions. *Id.*  
 22 Federal and state courts throughout the United States, including this Court and other courts in this  
 23 Circuit, regularly appoint A.B. Data to provide notice of class actions. *Id.* ¶¶ 4–6. A comprehensive  
 24 summary of A.B. Data's previous appointments is attached to the Miller Decl. as Exhibit 2.

25 In seeking a notice administrator, Plaintiffs sent RFPs to multiple leading notice-  
 26 administration firms based on positive experiences in other cases, and each candidate submitted a  
 27 detailed proposal. A.B. Data was selected because its proposal was cost competitive and it has



substantial experience administering notice in complex class actions in this District (and throughout the country). Plaintiffs' Co-lead Counsel have engaged A.B. Data only for notice and claims-administration services and have no financial or other ties with A.B. Data. Miller Decl. ¶ 7.

These qualifications justify the appointment of A.B. Data as the notice administrator.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court grant their motion and enter the proposed Order Authorizing Distribution of Notice to the Class and Appointing Notice Administrator.

Dated: November 19, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Reena A. Gambhir

Manuel J. Dominguez (*pro hac vice*)  
COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS &  
TOLL PLLC  
11780 U.S. Highway One, Suite N500  
Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33408  
Tel: 561-515-2604  
Fax: 561-515-1401  
Email: jdominguez@cohenmilstein.com  
Benjamin D. Brown (SBN 202545)  
Daniel McCuaig (*pro hac vice*)  
Zachary R. Glubiak (*pro hac vice*)  
COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS &  
TOLL PLLC  
1100 New York Ave., Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel: 202-408-4600  
Fax: 202-408-4699  
Email: bbrown@cohenmilstein.com  
dmccuaig@cohenmilstein.com  
zglubiak@cohenmilstein.com

Reena A. Gambhir (*pro hac vice*)  
HAUSFELD LLP  
1200 17th Street, N.W., Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20036  
Tel: 202-540-7200  
Fax: 202-540-7201  
Email: rgambhir@hausfeld.com

Gary I. Smith, Jr. (SBN 344865)  
Samuel Maida (SBN 333835)  
HAUSFELD LLP  
600 Montgomery Street, Suite  
3200 San Francisco, CA 94111  
Tel: 415-633-1908  
Fax: 415-358-4980  
Email: gsmith@hausfeld.com  
smaida@hausfeld.com

1 Christopher J. Bateman (*pro hac vice*)  
2 COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS &  
3 TOLL PLLC  
4 88 Pine Street, 14th Floor  
5 New York, NY 10005  
6 Tel: 212-838-7797  
7 Fax: 212-838-7745  
8 Email: cbateman@cohenmilstein.com

Jeannine M. Kenney (*pro hac vice*)  
HAUSFELD LLP  
325 Chestnut Street, Suite 900  
Philadelphia, PA 19106  
Tel: 215-985-3270  
Fax: 215-985-3271  
Email: jkenney@hausfeld.com

6 Jeffrey J. Corrigan (*pro hac vice*)  
7 Jeffrey L. Spector (*pro hac vice*)  
8 SPECTOR ROSEMAN & KODROFF, P.C.  
9 2001 Market Street, Suite 3420  
10 Philadelphia, PA 19103  
11 Tel: 215-496-0300  
12 Fax: 215-496-6611  
13 Email: jcorrigan@srkattorneys.com  
14 jspector@srkattorneys.com

11  
12 *Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Class*

13 Michael J. Boni  
14 Joshua D. Snyder (*pro hac vice*)  
15 John E. Sindoni (*pro hac vice*)  
16 BONI, ZACK & SNYDER LLC  
17 15 St. Asaphs Road  
18 Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004  
19 Tel: 610-822-0200  
20 Fax: 610-822-0206  
21 Email: mboni@bonizack.com  
22 jsnyder@bonizack.com  
23 jsindoni@bonizack.com

24  
25 *Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Class*